

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 9 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a). Each of these claims have been amended herein so as to incorporate changes suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. (U.S. 5,489,923) in view Ogawa (U.S. 5,572,251), and further in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. 5,742,279).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

“wherein a logical product of a first pixel value in a current field line and a second pixel value in one of an immediately preceding field and a third pixel value in an immediately subsequent field is obtained, and wherein the bright point is determined to exist only when both pixel values of adjacent field are on.”

In explaining the above 103 rejection, the Examiner apparently only relies on Ogawa for teaching the above features of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Ogawa as applied by the Examiner does not specifically disclose the above features of claim 1. In support thereof, reference is made to lines 36-42 of column 6 of Ogawa wherein the following is recited:

In the next step S12, all the pixels in the LCD mask 26 are switched off so as to be in a perfect light-shielding state. In step S13, for example, four elements constituting the window 45, that is, pixels [i, j], [i+1, j], [i, j+1] and [i+1, j+1] are switched on. Because the relation $i=j=0$ holds in this case, **the window 45 is formed at the left upper corner as shown in FIG. 7C.** (Emphasis ours.)

Thus, the area of ON (light-transmitting portions) and OFF (light-shielding portions) may be determined for every block and the area of ON is formed at the left upper

corner of the window. Accordingly, it is believed that amended independent claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Marshall, Ogawa and Yamamoto.

For somewhat similar reasons, it is also believed that amended independent claims 4, 5, and 9 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Marshall, Ogawa and Yamamoto. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from independent claim 1 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Marshall, Ogawa and Yamamoto for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9 were rejected under 35. U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. in view of Takaha et al. (U.S. 6,021,221).

In the listing of the above 103 rejection on the bottom of page 4 of the present Office Action, the Examiner did not indicate "Ogawa." However, in explaining this rejection on page 5 of the present Office Action the Examiner appears to rely on Ogawa. Accordingly, it is unclear whether or not the Examiner intended to include Ogawa as a basis for this rejection. In any event, the Examiner does not appear to rely on Takaha to overcome the above described deficiencies of Ogawa. Accordingly, it is believed that amended independent claim 1 is distinguishable from the possible applied combination of Marshall and Takaha or Marshall, Ogawa and Takaha for reasons similar to those previously described.

Similarly, it is also believed that amended independent claims 4, 5, and 9 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Marshall and Takaha or Marshall, Ogawa and Takaha.


In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 9 and the allowance of this application with claims 1-5 and 9 are respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 
Dennis M. Smid
Registration No. 34,930
Tel. (212) 588-0800